



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,596	04/30/2001	Cornelis Bernardus Aloysius Wouters	PHNL 000240	4795

24737 7590 08/04/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

CHOI, WOO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,596

Applicant(s)

WOUTERS, CORNELIS
BERNARDUS ALOYSIUS

Examiner

Woo H. Choi

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The limitation “predetermined number” as related to the determination of majority found in the amended portion of the claims does not appear in the specification. Also, inhibition (or lack thereof) of determination of wear level claimed in the newly added claim, claim 15, is not discussed in the specification.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claims should end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 7, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2186

The claimed limitation “a predetermined number, which is at least the majority, of the counters of the blocks from said variety” is not supported by the specification.

The Office asks Applicant to specifically point out where in the specification such a limitation is supported.

5. Claims 2 – 3, 5 – 6, 8 – 9, and 11 – 15 are rejected for including the deficiencies of their parent claims discussed above.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The negative limitation introduced in the newly added claim 15, “wherein said determining is not inhibited after said value ...” is not supported in the specification.

The Office asks Applicant to specifically point out where in the specification such a limitation is supported.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11 – 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assar *et al.* (PCT Publication No. WO 95/10083, hereinafter “Assar”).

9. With respect to claims 1, 7, and 13, Assar discloses a method of data management on a storage medium (figure 6, Flash Memory Device), the storage medium comprising a variety of blocks in which data can be stored, a first block from said variety being selected to execute a mutation on, characterized by determining whether the wear level of the first block is acceptable for executing the mutation, and if so, executing the mutation on the first block, and otherwise choosing from said variety a second block with a lower wear level than the first block, and copying the data of the second block to the first block (page 16, lines 19 – 29),

wherein the blocks from said variety have an associated counter for counting the number of mutations in the block concerned (figure 10, 620).

However, Assar does not specifically disclose that the limit value is increased when a predetermined number which is at least the majority of the counters of the blocks from said

Art Unit: 2186

variety exceed the limit value, said determining being based on said limit value and a value of the counter of the first block. On the other hand Assar discloses a functionally equivalent method where the limit value is effectively increased when a predetermined number which is at least the majority of the counters of the blocks from said variety reach a maximum value (page 16, lines 19 – 31) by resetting the counters (see also figure 7, step 238). The limit values in Applicant's and Assar's inventions are used for wear leveling which is a mechanism used to ensure that all blocks are written to or erased fairly evenly. In both inventions, when an erasure count reaches a certain threshold, the data content of the block is swapped with one that is less frequently erased and the block that reached the threshold is not erased until the next wear leveling cycle. When the majority of block erasure counters reach the threshold (i.e. wear level is fairly even), the threshold is lifted, or increased, relative to the counters, so that the blocks can be erased (or written to) again and the wear leveling cycle begins anew. In Applicant's invention, the threshold value is increased by increasing the limit value while retaining the counter values. Assar's invention increases this threshold by maintaining the limit value while resetting (or decreasing) the counter values.

The difference between Assar and the claims is the method of increasing the threshold value relative to the counter values to start a new wear leveling cycle. However, this particular method of increasing the limit value while retaining the counter values, as opposed to retaining the limit value while resetting the counter values, does not have a disclosed purpose nor is it disclosed to overcome any deficiencies in the prior art. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use the method of increase the threshold value for new wear

Art Unit: 2186

leveling cycle as opposed to resetting the counter values, since applicant has not disclosed that Applicant's method of increasing the threshold value relative to the counter values (or any other method of increasing the threshold value relative the counter values), overcomes a deficiency in the prior art or is for any stated purpose.

Because flash cell device has a maximum life in terms of erase-write cycles, there's a need to keep track of the total number of erase cycles to be able to determine the remaining life of a device. One would be motivated to use the method of increasing the limit value while keeping the total counts intact to be able to keep accurate track of the total number of erase cycles on a per block bases for optimal use of all of the blocks. On the other hand, the method of keeping the limit value while resetting the counter has the advantage of having smaller counters using less number of bits and requiring simpler comparison operations. However, since the total erase count is reset, the system can easily keep track of the overall wear level by keeping track of the number of wear-level cycle operations, but the total counts for individual blocks are lost. There are different advantages and disadvantages for each of the methods. A flash memory system designer would be motivated to choose one or the other depending on his/her preference and design criteria.

10. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11 – 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assar in view of Bruce *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,000,006, hereinafter "Bruce").

Art Unit: 2186

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 13, Assar discloses a method of data management on a storage medium (figure 6, Flash Memory Device), the storage medium comprising a variety of blocks in which data can be stored, a first block from said variety of blocks being selected to execute a mutation on, characterized by determining whether the wear level of the first block is acceptable for executing the mutation, and if so, executing the mutation on the first block, and otherwise choosing from said variety a second block with a lower wear level than the first block, and copying the data of the second block to the first block (page 16, lines 19 – 29),

wherein the blocks from said variety have an associated counter for counting the number of mutations in the block concerned (figure 10, 620).

However, Assar does not specifically disclose that the limit value is increased when a predetermined number which is at least the majority of the counters of the blocks from said variety exceed the limit value, said determining being based on said limit value and a value of the counter of the first block. On the other hand, Bruce discloses a method of data management on a storage medium comprising a variety of blocks in which data can be store, where the limit value is increased when a predetermined number which is at least the majority of the counters of the blocks from the variety of blocks exceed the limit value (abstract, last 4 sentences, col. 9, lines 13 – 20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Assar and Bruce before him at the time the invention was made, to use the threshold adjustment teachings of the flash memory storage system of Bruce, in the flash memory storage system of

Art Unit: 2186

Assar, in order to minimize excess writes to flash memory while re-mapping address to pages of flash memory and be able to use a unified table for re-mapping, wear-leveling, and caching flash memories (Bruce, col. 2, lines 55 – 59).

It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Assar and Bruce before him at the time the invention was made, to use the threshold adjustment teachings of the flash memory storage system of Bruce, in the flash memory storage system of Assar, in order to be able to determine the total number of erase/write cycles to a given block of flash memory (Bruce, col. 2, lines 31 – 33).

11. With respect to claims 2 and 8, the method is characterized in that when the value of the counter of the first block is smaller than the limit value, the value of the counter is increased and the mutation is executed, and otherwise a block of which the counter has a lower value than the counter of the first block is chosen as the second block (Assar, page 16, lines 20 – 25).

12. With respect to claims 3 and 9, the method is characterized in that the lower value is the lowest value of the values of the counters of the blocks from said variety (Assar, page 16, lines 22 – 25).

13. With respect to claims 5 and 12, the method is characterized in that the second block is erased after the data of the second block have been copied to the first block (this is inherent in

Art Unit: 2186

flash memory store as the flash memory cells need to be erased before new information can be written).

14. With respect to claim 6, the method is characterized in that the mutation comprises erasing the first block (Assar, page 16, lines 22 – 25).

15. With respect to claim 11, the system is characterized in that the system is arranged for initially constructing a table in which the value of the counters of the blocks are stated (Assar, figure 9).

16. With respect to claim 15, said determination is not inhibited in Bruce's system.

17. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assar, or Asser in view of Bruce as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Masters (US Patent No. 6,092,160).

Asser and Bruce disclose all of the limitations of the parent claim as discussed above. However, they do not specifically disclose that said copying is preceded by the step of copying to another block any stored data of said first block that is not marked for erasure. On the other hand, Bruce discloses swapping blocks for wear leveling (col. 7, lines 51 – 54). Masters discloses a method of wear-leveling flash memory where copying of less frequently used second

Art Unit: 2186

block to the more frequently used first block involves swapping the data between the first block and the second block (Masters, figure 5, 512, Lofgren, figure 5).

Applicants claimed step is a specific sequence in the swapping operation where the content of the first block is temporarily stored in a third location before the content of the second block is copied to the first block, so that the original data in the first block is preserved and copied over to the second block to complete the swapping operation. The use of a third storage location is inherent in a data swapping operation, as a temporary storage location is required to be able to swap data without losing any information. As to the specific sequence of steps in a swapping operation, one skilled in the art would recognize that there are two ways to perform the swapping operation, just as there are two ways to add two numbers to obtain a sum of two numbers. The first sequence is to copy the first block to a temporary store, copy the second block to the first block, and then copy the original content of the first block from the temporary store to the second block. The second way is to copy the second block to the temporary store, copy the first block to the second block and finally copy the data from the second block from the temporary store to the first block. One skilled in the art would have further recognized that either sequence can be used equally effectively to swap the data, just as adding a first number to a second number is as effective as adding the second number to the first number in obtaining a sum of two numbers.

It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Assar and Bruce before him at the time the invention was made, to use the data swapping for

Art Unit: 2186

wear leveling teaching of the flash memory storage system of Masters, in the flash memory storage system of Assar, so that the little worn block becomes heavily used and wear on the heavily worn block is substantially reduced (Masters col. 9, lines 52 - 53).

Response to Amendment

18. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to remove inconsistencies resulting from the use of the limitations “said variety of blocks” and “said variety” to refer to the same limitation.

Therefore, prior objections to the claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 are withdrawn.

19. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, and 11 – 13 have been amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Corresponding rejections are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant’s arguments regarding the finality of the last Office Action, mailed 2 June 2003 is persuasive. The finality of the last Office Action is withdrawn.

21. With respect to Applicant’s argument regarding the motivation to choose the method of increasing the threshold while maintaining the total count, it seems that Applicant is arguing that his contribution to the art and patentable difference between his invention and Assar is to use more storage and computing resources to perform the same function. The motivations are addressed above.

Art Unit: 2186

22. With respect to Applicant's argument against the combination of Assar's and Bruce's teaching, Applicant has clearly misinterpreted Bruce's disclosure. The section of the Bruce reference that Applicant quotes for his argument does *not* discuss Bruce's invention. It is in the background section where Bruce points out problems with prior art flash systems. In fact, the passage quoted by Applicant contains a strong motivation to use Bruce's teachings.

Conclusion

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Woo H. Choi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2186

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

whc
whc
July 30, 2003


MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100